UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/537,992	06/09/2005	Hiroshi Matsui	081356-0243	1370	
	7590 10/22/200 LARDNER LLP	EXAMINER			
SUITE 500			MARTIN, PAUL C		
3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1657	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/22/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/537,992	MATSUI, HIROSHI			
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	PAUL C. MARTIN	1657			
All Participants:	Status of Application: pen	ding			
(1) <u>PAUL C. MARTIN</u> .	(3) <u>Yang Tang</u> .				
(2) <u>Jon Weber</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 16 October 2008	Time: <u>1:30pm</u>				
Type of Interview:					
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: 112, 1 st paragraph enablement rejection regarding the specificity and identity of the surfactants used in the method.					
Claims discussed:					
Prior art documents discussed:					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 					
/Paul C Martin/ Examiner, Art Unit 1657 (A)	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Application No. 10/537,992

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner had suggested amending the claims to more clearly delineate the difference between the two surfactants based upon tightening the HLB ranges described in the Specification. The problem the Examiner had was that the two surfactants are of the same class and are only distinguishable by their activities and HLB values, if the HLB values are 13 the difference between and HLB value of 13 and "less" than 13 cannot be practically differentiated. The Applicant's representative does not agree with the Examiner's position but agreed to entertain suggestions to be provided at a later date for possible claim amendments as long as the issue of New Matter was avoided.